

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 19, 21, 22, and 36-60 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 36, 44, 51, 58, 59, and 60. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 5, 7-9, 11-18, 20, and 23-35. New claims added herein are none.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0005] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0006] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0007] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 36, 44, 51, 58, 59, and 60 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to cited prior art.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 102

[0008] The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6, 10, 19, 21, 22, and 36-60 under §102. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not shown that cited reference anticipates the rejected claims.

[0009] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0010] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following reference:

- **Korn:** *Korn*, US Patent No. 6,880,083 (issued Apr 12, 2005)

Overview of the Application

[0011] The Application describes a technology for limiting access to potentially dangerous code. Methods and systems are described that allow a control to be invoked only by an authenticated and authorized application. A web page is described that

invokes a software control that has been previously downloaded to a Client computer, or which is contained in the web page to be downloaded by the Client computer. The web page is digitally signed by the author so that the Client computer can ensure that the control is being invoked by a trusted source. A confirmation module located in a web browser on the Client computer or in the control itself authenticates the digital signature and confirms whether the web page is authorized by the Client computer to invoke the control. If the web page is authenticated and authorized, then the Client computer allows the web page to invoke the control.

[0012] An invoking application is authenticated and authorized each time the control is invoked rather than only when the control is downloaded. Therefore, an unauthorized user cannot gain access to a control previously downloaded onto the Client computer.

Cited Reference

Korn

[0013] Korn describes a technology for creating a secure script. Executable commands in the script are hashed, and the hashed values for the commands are encrypted and appended to the script. Before executing the script, a hashed value for each executable command in a script is computed and the encrypted hashed value appended to the script for each executable command in the script is decrypted to obtain a decrypted hashed value for each executable command in the script. The hashed value and the decrypted hashed value for each executable command is compared, and if the values are the same, the command is executed.

Anticipation Rejections

[0014] Applicant submits that the anticipation rejections are not valid because, for each rejected claim, no single reference discloses each and every element of that rejected claim.¹ Furthermore, the elements disclosed in the single reference are not arranged in the manner recited by each rejected claim.²

[0015] The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6, 10, 19, 21, 22, and 36-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Korn. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims. Based on the reasons given below, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0016] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 2) the following with regard to this claim:

4. As per claim 1, Korn discloses a method, comprising: a first electronic device deriving a digital signature and associating the digital signature with a web page, wherein the web page includes code to invoke a control object, and wherein the web page does not include the control object (Korn: column 2 lines 39-65: hash value is generated for the script and the hash value is further encrypted as a digital signature); and subsequent to associating the digital signature with the web page, the first electronic device delivering the web page to a second electronic device capable of authenticating the digital signature such that the second electronic device executes at least a portion of the web page in response to authenticating the digital signature (Korn: column 3 lines 50-65: the encrypted hash value is decrypted using the public key and compared to see if the script can be executed).

¹ "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); also see MPEP §2131.

² See *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

[0017] Applicant submits that Korn does not anticipate this claim because it does not show or disclose the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- a **first electronic device digitally signing a web page**, wherein the web page includes code to invoke a control object, and **wherein the web page does not include the control object**; and
- subsequent to associating the digital signature with the web page, the first electronic device delivering the web page to a second electronic device capable of **authenticating the source of the web page based on the digital signature** such that the second electronic device executes at least a portion of the web page in response to authenticating the digital signature

[0018] In this Action, the Examiner equates the method regarding secure scripts disclosed by Korn with the method of “digitally signing a web page” and “authenticating the source of the web page based on the digital signature” recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0019] Korn identifies a web page containing a script that is hashed and encrypted and a control object that may be signed. Korn does not disclose a server digitally signing a web page that does not include the control object as is claimed. Furthermore, Korn does not authenticate the source of the web page based on the digital signature as recited in this claim.

[0020] In Korn, a digital signature associated with a control object may be used to verify the authenticity of the control object, but does not prevent a second web page from maliciously accessing the control object that was previously downloaded to a client device by a first web page. By digitally signing a web page that includes code to invoke a control object, a client device can then verify the authenticity of the web page before allowing the web page to invoke the control object. While the control object itself may be digitally signed, the signature associated with the control object does not provide a way to verify the authenticity of the web page invoking the control object as in the instant claim.

[0021] Consequently, Korn does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 36, 44, 51, 58, 59, and 60

[0022] Independent claims 36, 44, 51, 58, 59, and 60 contain similar features to those claimed in claim 1 discussed above, and were rejected using similar rational. Thus, Applicant submits that Korn does not anticipate these claims for at least the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6, 10, 19-22, 37-43, 45-50, and 52-57

[0023] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1, 36, 44, and 52. As discussed above, claims 1, 36, 44, and 52 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Conclusion

[0024] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action. Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 08/29/2007

By: 
Bea Koempel-Thomas
Reg. No. 58213
(509) 324-9256 x259
bea@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com